

Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. No claims are cancelled, amended, or newly added. In view of the following remarks, allowance of all the rejected claims is requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Hurwood et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,772,137). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the following basis.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other things, determining, from the plurality of object repository types, the one or more object repository types that store at least one object, wherein the object comprises metadata. Independent claims 6, 11, and 16 include similar recitations, among other things.

In an exemplary embodiment, a work request may be processed by determining a repository type from which information content is gathered (see the specification at page 10, lines 13 and 14). The repository type may include one of a plurality of possible types, such as, for example, Lotus Notes, Lotus QuickPlace, Domino.doc, electronic mail, Web and file system, *etc.* (see the specification at page 4, lines 22 and 23).

Hurwood appears to disclose a system for managing data objects. It appears that Hurwood's disclosed system enables a user to submit a data query and the system determines whether the query may be processed in its original format (*see* column 3, lines 40-55). Hurwood does not disclose determining one or more object repository types that store an object, as claimed. At best, it appears that Hurwood discloses including multiple data storage devices that may store different types of data (*see* column 3, lines 35-40). However, maintaining storage devices that may store different types of data is not the same as determining one or more object repository types that store objects. Thus, claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 are not anticipated by Hurwood.

Claims 2-4, 7-9, 11-14, and 17-19 depend from and provide additional features to corresponding ones of claims 1, 6, 11, and 16. The Examiner admits that Hurwood fails to

specifically disclose the additional features provided by these claims and relies on Shanahan to overcome these deficiencies. However, even if Shanahan discloses these features, the combination of Hurwood and Shanahan does not teach or suggest determining, from the plurality of object repository types, the one or more object repository types that store at least one object, wherein the object comprises metadata. As such, claims 2-4, 7-9, 11-14, and 17-19 are allowable over the cited references.

With respect to claims 5, 10, and 20, the Examiner admits that Shanahan is deficient at least for failing to disclose a processor that comprises at least one of a full-text engine, a metrics engine, and a taxonomy engine. The Examiner alleges that Summerlin discloses this feature and attempts to cure the admitted deficiency of Shanahan through combination with Summerlin. Summerlin is apparently drawn to a system for automatically classifying electronic documents that are candidates to become an official record (see Summerlin at the Abstract). However, even if the Examiner's allegation regarding the disclosure of Summerlin is accurate, Hurwood, Shanahan and Summerlin, both alone and in combination, do not teach or suggest determining, from the plurality of object repository types, the one or more object repository types that store at least one object, wherein the object comprises metadata. Since claims 5, 10, and 20 depend from independent claims 1, 6, and 16, respectively, these claims are allowable at least by virtue of dependency, as well as for the features that they add.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: August 2, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Sean L. Ingram
Registration No.: 48,283
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1600 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, Virginia 22102
703-905-2000